

REMARKS

Rejection Summary

Claims 1-9, 12-16, 18, 20-21 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 17, 19 and 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 10-11 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant respectfully traverses all the outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal thereof in view of the following remarks.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to include the base claim and all other dependent claims. Claim 10 include the features of claim 9, 8, 2 and 1. Claims 11 now includes the feature s of claims 9, 8, 2 and 1.

Claims 1 – 9 and 12-28 have been canceled without prejudice.

Therefore no new matter has been added.

No amendment or argument was made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 10 and 11. This objection is respectfully traversed as the claims have been combine in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Claims 1-9, 12-16, 18, 20-21 and 23-28 over Gallagher et al. U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0192211 (Gallagher).

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, claims 17 over Gallagher.

The Office Action also rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, claim 19 and 21 over Gallagher in view of Examiner's official Notice.

Claims 1-9 and 12028 have been cancelled.

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to include the base claim and all other dependent claims. Claim 10 include the features of claim 9, 8, 2 and 1. Claims 11 now includes the feature s of claims 9, 8, 2 and 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 10 and 11 define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Respectfully submitted,

/DAVID S NOSKOWICZ/

David S. Noskowicz
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 55,503

Dated: 02 January 2008

Phone No. (847) 523-2333
Fax No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property
600 North U.S. Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048